import of white/refined sugar under OGL has been opened to other Central/State Government agencies and to private trade in addition to existing designated agencies.

Like in the case of existing duty free import of white/refined sugar under OGL by designated agencies up to 01.08.09, import of white/refined sugar by such agencies up to the extended date of 30.11.09 as well as similar imports by other Central/State Government agencies and private trade up to that date have been kept free of regulated release mechanism as well as levy obligation.

It is expected that with these decisions, domestic availability of sugar would get further augmented and sugar prices in the country would remain at reasonable levels.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will take up further discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. As announced yesterday, there are two hon. Members left who will participate in the discussion. One is the Leader of Opposition and the other is Shri Sitaram Yechury. As they were not there yesterday, they had requested to be accommodated today. Afterwards there will be a reply by the hon. Minister. I would like to just remind that by 1 o'clock the reply and the intervention should be completed.

———————

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Thank you, Sir. I will keep the time constraint in mind. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity today. Sir, a very fruitful discussion took place yesterday and a very serious concern has been expressed by the hon. Members cutting across the entire political spectrum in this House about which way the Indian foreign policy is going. This is a serious concern for us because we think that progressively we are moving into a situation where we are moving away from our independent foreign policy and are ending up being a subordinate ally of the USA and US imperialism. There are a series of statements that have come from this Government since it assumed office and that are a cause of concern.

The hon. Minister for External Affairs had informed this House, "We (meaning India and the USA) have also agreed on a bilateral dialogue architecture within which we will continue discussions between our two countries on a wide range of issues." These wide range of issues are connected not only with the fact that the assurance, given by the Prime Minister on the Indo-US Civil Nuclear Deal saying that we will get full civil nuclear cooperation, has now been negated. But it does not confine itself only to that area, it moves across all the major issues that are important in the world today, including climate change, the Doha Round of talks as far as the WTO is concerned, and the non-proliferation architecture to which we are being subjected to a lot of pressures.

Just on the eve of the visit of US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, at least, four spokesmen of the Obama Administration in the USA have stated very clearly what they expect and, post-visit, they have expressed their satisfaction at the visit. I would quote one of them. It says, "The deal would be a tangible accomplishment of Hillary Clinton's first trip to India as U.S. Secretary of State and it could prove a boon to US companies such as Lockheed Martin and Boeing." This deal is the signing of End-Use Monitoring Agreement. And this End-Use Monitoring Agreement will open up now a huge level of defence cooperation and sale of defence equipment to India from the USA. And what we had suspected at the time of the 123 Agreement that the real target was not 123 but it was 126 — 126 military planes that India is going to buy. That was the real target that the USA wanted and that has been achieved.

You have a deepening military cooperation with the USA. For 50 years, more than half a century, we know that Pakistan has been a very steadfast ally of the USA. By allowing them to come and survey where all these equipments bought from the USA are going to be installed, you are creating a new security threat for India. Both in the context of India-Pakistan and in the global context, this is something which is seriously jeopardising our sovereignty. Now this is something, Sir, which we cannot and should not accept.

In fact, on the eve of Hillary Clinton's visit *The New York Time*s editorial has pointed out the US agenda. And what does it begin with, Sir? It says, "Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and his party have a strong mandate.....that means it has no excuses not to do more." In other words, what it means is that they no longer have to rely on our support to continue in the Government. So, they have no excuses not to do more. So what should we do? What should India do, Sir? I quote, "India wants to be seen as a major world power. For that to happen, it will have to drop its pretensions to Non-Alignment and stake out strong and constructive positions." That is: give up your independent foreign policy; give up your commitment to Non-Alignment; ally with the USA; and conduct your foreign policy accordingly.

Then it says, "During the negotiations on the Indo-US Nuclear deal, the Bush administration managed to persuade New Delhi (please, note, Sir, managed to persuade New Delhi) to grudgingly support United Nations Security Council sanctions against Iran's nuclear programmes. India now needs to do more."

The expectation that is coming...*(Interruptions)*... It is *The New York Times* editorial of 18th July. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Kerala): Whatever they say, it is a Bible for you. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: It is based on the statement of the US spokesmen. ...*(Interruptions)*... Don't dismiss it as media report. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kurien, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: It is a Bible to you. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: It has become a Bible to you. That is my problem. ...(Interruptions)...

DR. K. KESHAVA RAO (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, yesterday...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't worry, the Minister will reply. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Keshava Rao, he is raising some issues. It is a discussion. The hon. Minister will have to reply and he will reply. Why is this intervention? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, my fear is that they are increasingly progressing towards becoming a subordinate ally to the USA. Why are you so impatient? You just hear and at least reply to our concerns.

Sir, regarding support on the question of Iran, the U.S. spokesman of the Obama Administration says, "Yes, India has come so far on the question of Iran. It has to do more." Now, that is the expectation the U.S. is having and that is the sort of agreements that you are entering into. They are now talking about the global non-proliferation architecture. And, what is that? It means, till India signs the NPT, the CTBT and the FMCT, there will be no transfer of technologies, which are called the ENR technologies, by the U.S. We want an assurance from this Government that till this full cooperation is done and the transfer of technology is made available to us without signing the NPT, the CTBT and the FMCT, we should not purchase any U.S. nuclear reactors for our country. Until that is done, no nuclear commerce with the U.S. should be permitted. That has to be stated.

Further, Sir, on the question of global climate change and on the question of Doha, I don't want to repeat anything. I know there is a time constraint. But, the stated position of India is — particularly since the hon. Minister for Agriculture is also here — we cannot compromise on both issues of agricultural safeguards and non-agricultural market access, which is called NAMA. On climate change, we cannot accept universal standards for reduction of greenhouse emissions. That is always in advantage of the industrial countries, who, in the first place, are the reason for this climate change to take place. We cannot accept any standards that are universal between them and us. India today has one-tenth of the per capita gas emissions that the U.S. has, and for us to accept those norms as equal and universally is something not acceptable. That will affect growth progress and alleviation of poverty in our country. So, that is something on which we want an assurance from the Government.

Sir, much of this discussion has been contained on the recent joint statement by the Prime Ministers of India and Pakistan. We have had two statements given by the Indian Prime Minister — one to both Houses and one in the other House. But, there is a glaring contradiction that is emerging from this. And, Sir, our apprehension is, these contradictions are emerging precisely because of the U.S. pressures. What are these contradictions? On the 17th of July, the hon. Prime Minister in this House says, "The starting point of any meaningful dialogue with Pakistan is

fulfilment of their commitment in letter and spirit not to allow their territory to be used in any manner for terrorist activities against India." Please underline the words 'starting point of any meaningful dialogue'. This was on the 17th of July. On 29th of July, speaking in the other House, the Prime Minister says, "It is impossible for any Government in India to work towards full normalisation of relations with Pakistan....." The same sentence follows. From 'starting point for meaningful dialogue' to 'full normalisation of relations'. Why is this change in 12 days? You cannot have full normalisation without a dialogue. How can you have normalisation of relations without a dialogue? Earlier, you said that there can be no dialogue unless Pakistan commits to this. And, here you say, it will be full normalisation of relations. There is not only a contradiction between the statements of 17th and 29th but there is also a contradiction in the statement of 29th itself — page 1 of it says, 'towards full normalisation' and page 4 says, "I wish to reiterate that we can have a meaningful dialogue with Pakistan only if they fulfil their commitment in letter and spirit and not allow their territories....." Again, it is said that dialogue can happen only if they fulfil their commitment in letter and spirit. Earlier, you said that full normalisation of relations can happen only if they fulfil their commitment in letter and spirit. The process is, unless you have dialogue, you can't have full normalisation. ...*(Time-bell rings)*... Sorry, I am just concluding. So, what is the commitment you are seeking today? Is it a commitment to start the dialogue? Is it a commitment saying that we will start the dialogue, but, we will not normalise till you do that? Why is this confusion? At a later stage, the Prime Minister himself says something with which I fully agree. He says, "India seeks cooperative relations with Pakistan and engagement is the only way forward to realise the vision of a stable and prosperous South Asia." I fully agree. Yes, dialogue process has to be there. But, on what terms? On what terms are you going to have this dialogue? And on the question of terms, you have a lot of confusion that has been expressed and I do not agree with the view expressed that there is a problem in drafting because people who have drafted this have been drafting for the last 30 years. They are on the eve of their retirement from service. And they have served India very well and very admirably. Don't make them the scapegoats by saying that it is bad drafting. It is not a question of bad drafting. It is a muddled mind because of which these contradictions are happening. The muddling is happening because of U.S. pressures on our foreign policy. And that is what is of deep concern. So, Sir, I want to also bring in the reference to Balochistan. That cannot be because of bad drafting! They say, "We have nothing to hide." Very good. We have nothing to hide. We, indeed, have nothing to hide. If we have nothing to hide, why is there a reference? Again, U.S. pressure! Why? It is because — I will quote one of these spokespersons—one of the spokespersons of Obama Administration says: "India has to allay Pakistan's fears." In order to allay Pakistan's fears, you bring in Balochistan! Now, you create a new problem, a new bone of contention between us! So, all these matters that have come in, Sir, are a reflection of a

Government that is increasingly succumbing to U.S. and U.S. pressures on our foreign policy. That is something that cannot be allowed.

Finally, Sir, so far, we have had a consensus on foreign policy. We have had, by and large, a broad consensus, in the country, all these six decades, and that is something which, we find, the Government itself is breaking today, which is not acceptable. So, we want the Government to reassure, not only reassure the House but also to walk back, trace the steps backward on the way in which they are proceeding forward in becoming a subordinate ally of the United States of America. And that is something that should not be allowed, Sir. Thank you.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Sir, undoubtedly, the Government of India, on the 16th of July, has committed a monumental lapse at Sharm-el-Sheikh. They have sought to reverse what was a consistent foreign policy of India in dealing with Pakistan, and delinked the desire for dialogue from action against terror. Having made this monumental mistake, what we now see, in the last 14-15 days, is an exercise to contain the damage and, therefore, arguments are now being invented in order to contain the damage. One argument which has been addressed to the whole country, now, is, "Yes, of course, we have a foreign policy consensus, and what we are, now, doing is to continue, *vis-a-vis*, with Pakistan, the line which was propounded by my leader, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. Sir, it gives us a great pleasure that for the first time, in over five years, we heard, from any representative of the U.P.A., a praise for what Mr. Vajpayee had done. Not only a praise, but 'Vajpayee' is, now, sought to be used as a shield to cover up for their own monumental lapse. But was this "the Vajpayee line" which was pursued between 1998 and 2004? Or, was it, exactly, the opposite of what Atalji had propounded and done? At the time when he took the initiative of going in a bus to Lahore, at the time of Kargil, and on all other occasions, we only found critical references coming from the Congress party. But, today, we find that they see virtue in each one of the initiatives that he had taken! Just compare the language of what Mr. Vajpayee had agreed to and what the present Prime Minister has agreed to.

> "On 6th January, 2004, Prime Minister Vajpayee and President Musharraf met at Islamabad."
>
> The operative sentence is—I quote—
>
> "Prime Minister Vajpayee said that in order to take forward and sustain the dialogue process, violence, hostility and terrorism must be prevented. President Musharraf reassured the Prime Minister, Mr. Vajpayee, that he will not permit any territory, under Pakistan's control, to be used to support terrorism in any manner."

Both things were categorical. "In order to sustain and continue a dialogue, terrorism must be prevented." And Pakistan says, "We will not allow our territory to be used." So, "the Vajpayee line", clearly, was: "I prefer a dialogue, but a dialogue will be without terror. I will negotiate with you from a point of strength." And what do we find, now, in the 16th June operative paragraph, from Sharm-el-Sheikh? "Both Prime Ministers recognised that dialogue is the only way forward. Action on terrorism should not be linked to a Composite Dialogue Process and these should not be bracketed". The 6th January, 2004 statement was very clear, "dialogue without terror"; the 16th July, 2009 statement is equally clear, "dialogue is important; dialogue irrespective of terror". After having agreed to the shameful draft, the whole country is now being told, well, this is the Vajpayee line that we are pursuing. The two can't be more diametrically opposite.

What is the purport of the 16th July statement? As my friend, Mr. Sitaram Yechury, has just now pointed out, it has two operative paragraphs. The first is on Balochistan. The Prime Minister Gilani mentioned that Pakistan had some information on threats in Balochistan and other areas. We are now being told that it was a unilateral reference by them for their own satisfaction. We all know how Joint Texts are prepared. Joint Texts never contain an irrelevant statement. Joint Texts never contain a unilateral statement. They contain only agreed texts. If an agreed text is not possible and if there is a difference, there will be the Pakistani view and the alternative Indian view which is equally expressed. What happens here? You make a reference to the threats in Balochistan because the Pakistani strategy — of course, India is not doing anything in Balochistan; the whole county is one behind the Government when the Prime Minister says that — is to give primacy to Balochistan so that the cross-border terrorism emanating from Pakistan takes a backseat. Besides Balochistan, there are other areas. Therefore, we allow a unilateral reference to Baluchistan to be carried, as far as this text is concerned. Then, we are going to take up a position, well, they wanted a reference; it is their internal affairs that they wanted it. We didn't make a reference to the Maoist activities in India in the draft. There was no occasion to do that. Pakistan would have said, "How does that concern us?". You don't make references and the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Within two days, Prime Minister Gilani gets up and says, "I have convinced India that there is interference as far as Balochistan is concerned and, therefore, for the first time, we have introduced a reference to Baluchistan in the draft".

Sir, what is the net effect of this? We went really for a composite dialogue to pursue what was the 6th January 2004 line. Then, we turn around and say, "Dialogue is the only way forward". There is a reasonable manner of interpreting the English language. The first sentence is, "Dialogue is the only way forward". It emphasises the primacy of dialogue and then says, "Action on terror should not be linked to the dialogue". When these sentences are taken together — one need not be scholar on diplomacy to understand it — and when these words "primacy of the dialogue" and "delinking" and "de-bracketed" — even both those words are

used between "terror" and "dialogue" — are seen together, it leads to only one possible meaning. The world has understood it in that way; Pakistan has understood in that way; the India media from day one, but for some management being done by the Government, has, by and large, understood in one way. Now, we want to do violence to the English language and say, let us give a patriotic interpretation. But a patriotic interpretation must be a reasonable interpretation which we can convince the rest of the world that this is what we meant. Today, what is the situation that we are faced with? This statement comes in the backdrop of 26/11 at Mumbai. After 26/11, with voluminous evidence and Pakistan is on its knees, with global pressure on it, as to why its territory has been used for terror against India despite assurances. We went with this complaint, with this grievance, and we came back with this albatross of Balochistan hanging on our neck. My friend, Dr. Singhvi, is here. There is a phrase they use in the Urdu language in courts. When you go with a complaint and come back with a counter complaint, they always say, "मुद्दई बन कर गए और मुद्दालेह बन कर लौटे।" My friend, Shri Satish Misra, is from UP, therefore, he understands it better. We went with a complaint on terror and came back with a stigma of Baluchistan on our forehead. This is what Sharm el-Sheikh has produced. Now we start a damage containment exercise. I think when you start a damage containment exercise, you end up making a mess because every explanation, as Shri Sitaram Yechury, very rightly pointed out, invents a new argument. How are these new arguments being invented? It was signed on 16th and on 17th itself, the Prime Minister made a statement in this House. What did the Prime Minister say in this House? I am repeating and just elaborating what Shri Sitaram Yechury has said. I am quoting from his statement. The real intention is dialogue irrespective of terror. The Prime Minister says on 17th in this House, "It has been and it remains our consistent position that the 'starting point' of any meaningful dialogue is a fulfilment of their commitment in letter and spirit not to allow their territory to be used for terrorism." On 17th, the Prime Minister was clear, "what I have said is — the language may be ambiguous — the starting point of the dialogue is terror must stop." The fair explanation or truthful explanation can be one, but when you are inventing explanations, they will always vary. On the 29th his statement to the whole country is, "I have said, time and again, and I repeat right now again, it is impossible for any Government in India to work towards full normalisation of relations with Pakistan unless the Government of Pakistan fulfils in letter and spirit its commitment not to allow its territory to be used in any manner for terrorist activities in India." So the starting point pre-condition was, the condition for a dialogue was, the starting point on 17th was that the terror must stop; Pakistani territory must not be used. On the 29th, this is now a condition not for starting a dialogue but for completing a dialogue for full normalisation of relations. So the word starting point of any negotiations on the 17th has now been replaced with full normalisation of relations with Pakistan.

Sir, a lot of my friends have spoken from the other side. Some very distinguished leaders and the President of the Congress Party also have addressed the Members of Parliament and a statement has been released to the whole country. There is no dispute with that statement. The moment a friend from the Congress Party or its President gets up and says, "Dialogue should not take place till terrorism stops", who is disagreeing with that? But do they have the courage of conviction to say that this is what the Joint Text says and this is what we are supporting? You can support a general statement 'no dialogue till terrorism stops.' But then that is not what the Joint Text says. So what the Congress Party and its leadership is saying is, we will keep quite on this Baluchistan lapse. So there is a stunning silence on the Baluchistan lapse. Instead of saying we support the Joint Statement, the entire exercise is we support what is now the explanation. But that explanation has a head on collusion with the Joint Statement. The two don't tally. That is unfortunately the condition. Sir, we have said it repeatedly that international relations are governed by joint texts. These are diplomatic documents. These are not legal documents, as Sashi says, which can be enforced in a court. But, next time round, when you sit at any level, the starting point is, let us lay down the rules of the game, with what have agreed in the past. When we start with what we have agreed in the past, that is the commencement of any negotiation. International relations are governed by joint texts and not by unilateral explanations which are given in your own country. Today, the unilateral explanation is: "How are we concerned with the reference to Balochistan? They could mention anything. The language may say something. But I mean what I wanted to mean." Sir, this is the second time we are hearing this phrase, "I mean what I wanted to mean." The first time, it was used by Humpty Dumpty to Alice in "Through the Looking Glass". So, the Government of India and the Prime Minister's stand now is, "I mean what I wanted to mean, and not what the language really says." When Alice asked Humpty, Dumpty, "How can clear words mean differently?", Humpty, Dumpty said, "It depends on who is the master, the word or me." So, today, we, actually, have a serious debate being reduced to a situation; you agree to a Joint Text, and now, you are going by something else.

Sir, this is my final submission. When the whole country is angered by this kind of a lapse, you now try to alarm the country. You try and alarm the country with a new argument that there are only two options available; it is either a dialogue or a war. I remember, President Bush saying, "Either, you are with us, or, you are against us." There was, obviously, a third space also available. But he didn't want the countries, the world, to have a third space. Today, you have a situation that either, it is a dialogue, or, it is a war. Sir, in Agra, the dialogue failed because we refused to accept Pakistan's interpretation and their documentation. We stuck to our position, and there was a stalemate. We have a meaningful engagement; we have High Commissions in both the countries. We have talks which take place at various levels. But then,

the moment, the Prime Minister limits his options to dialogue or war, he brings India to a position of weakness because the other alternative is war. You must now have a dialogue, or, otherwise, there will be war between two countries which are also nuclear-owning States; therefore, come down to a position of weakness and start negotiations. And, when you come down to a position of weakness and start negotiating, it is dialogue irrespective of terror. And, that is the line, which the present Government, effectively in the Joint Statement, has agreed to. Since the world is being told that this is the Vajpayee legacy that we have continued, I think, it is my responsibility to end by saying that when Vajpayeeji took this line of 'dialogue but without terror', India was in a position of strength. When the Prime Minister takes this line that the only other option is war, and, therefore, have a dialogue, it is a dialogue irrespective of terror, and he brings India to a position of weakness. And that, I think, has a lot which the present Government has to answer.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the Minister to reply...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Sir, just one sentence...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have already decided. Then, so many other clarifications will follow.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI S.M. KRISHNA): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to thank all the Members, who have participated in this important discussion on the Foreign Policy and the Working of the Ministry of External Affairs. I would apologise to some of the Members, that when they spoke, I could not be present in the House for the simple reason that I had to be present in the other House to reply to the debate. Perhaps, I have missed myself to get more educated about foreign policy issues. I refer particularly to the two speeches made yesterday. My esteemed friend, Mr. Arun Shourie, made one of the most incisive speeches. I may not agree with all that Mr. Arun Shourie said, but I certainly would compliment him on representing the other point of view possibly. There was also the speech of my esteemed friend, Mr. N.K. Singh, who brought in the debate, I think, a more pointed reference to the reorganisation of the Foreign Affairs Ministry itself. Having worked with the Government, his suggestions need the most careful consideration by the Government. And, this morning, we have heard two speeches, one from my esteemed friend, Shri Sitaram Yechury. But Mr. Yechury has pursued the line in which he very sincerely believes. Well, let me hasten to add that I do not share your perception of the world as you see it; we have our perception of the world as we see it. And this has been going on for quite some time. The divide is there. And I have no hesitation in accepting that. There was also a very forceful speech by the Leader of the Opposition. Whenever the Leader of the Opposition speaks, he speaks with force; he speaks with emphasis. Well, he has made certain points which we have heard before. I would like to meet some of these points in the course of my reply to the debate

Sir, let me start by conveying to this august House that the dynamics of India's foreign policy flow directly from the aspirations of our people. Inspired by the vision of our founding

fathers, our foreign policy is distinguished by a tradition of continuity and consensus. At the core of this continuity is autonomy of decision-making and independence of thought and action and upholding of the values of pluralism, democracy and secularism. From this bedrock of values came our prominent role in the Non-Aligned Movement which was recently reaffirmed during our attendance and participation in the 15th Non-Aligned Summit in Egypt from 15th-16th of July. This same bedrock remains today, as we see, to creatively respond to new challenges and opportunities. The other key elements of this continuity are our belief in friendly relations with all countries, resolution of conflicts by peaceful means and an approach marked by maturity and balance in the conduct of international relations. We have never abdicated our international responsibilities. In the new century, against the backdrop of new challenges that dot the international landscape, these core principles, in particular the autonomy of our decision-making, have enabled India to successfully pursue a multi-dimensional foreign policy of seeking strategic engagement, partnership and dialogue with all major global players. We have been able to do so without creating any contradiction or hyphenation between one set of relations and another. We are more connected with the world today than ever before in the past. India's steady ascendance as an economic power has expanded her circle of interaction and engagement with the rest of the world. One of the main challenges of our foreign policy lies in creating and maintaining a regional and international environment which would enable us to sustain a high rate of economic growth, create more opportunities for Indian entrepreneurship and enable India to realise her vast latent potential. The pursuit of enhanced trade, investment inflows, technology transfers, energy security and other economic imperatives has become an overarching imperative of our foreign policy. At the same time, India's own established capabilities, particularly in the field of some of the frontier technologies, like space, information technology, biotechnology and pharmaceuticals, and her frontline role in the global knowledge economy have imparted a new confidence and strength to our Foreign Policy initiatives. To achieve and accelerate India's developmental transformation through enhanced interaction with the global economy, a neighbourhood policy that ensures a peaceful periphery and to continuously seek a supportive international environment, therefore, remain the fundamental objective of India's foreign policy. With this objective in mind, a major focus of Indian foreign policy over the years has been the establishment and consolidation of good neighbourly relations with the countries in South Asia. In this context, ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI BALBIR PUNJ (Orissa): *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Punj, this is not the way. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, no; ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing will go on record...*(Interruptions)*.... Mr. Punj, you cannot say how the Minister should reply to the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, no. Don't interrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*...

*Not recorded.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: In this context, India has worked for ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This has been the tradition. Sometimes, people read from the text, they quote also. But, you cannot say that you are in a conference ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI BALBIR PUNJ: *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Punj, how did you come to the conclusion that he did not address the issues raised in the debate? He has still not concluded. Don't come to the conclusion and disturb the debate. ...*(Interruptions)*... You are all senior Members. We should respect each other. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Sir, I would like to assure the hon. Member that I came to Parliament in 1968. So, I have seen very many eminent Parliamentarians and eminent Ministers speaking on the floor of the House. So, you will have to pardon that much of margin to me also.

In this context, India has worked for the evolution of SAARC into an effective organisation that will promote meaningful regional integration. At the bilateral level, India has significant economic assistance programmes to assist the Governments of Bhutan and Nepal, in their developmental efforts. We have provided full support to the peace process in Nepal. We are also fully engaged with Nepal through a regular exchange of high-level visits and regular meetings of institutional mechanisms of various levels with Nepal.

Despite the terrorist attack on the Indian Embassy in Kabul in July, 2008 and continued security threats to the personnel of our Embassy and Consulates in Afghanistan, and to those implementing development projects there, the Government of India is committed to provide assistance to the Government and people of Afghanistan in their reconstruction effort. Our developmental and reconstruction assistance programmes are widely appreciated by the Government and people of Afghanistan.

Sir, the Sri Lankan issue was raised by Dr. K. Malaisamy and Shrimati Jayanathi Natarajan. In Sri Lanka, we have seen a new phase in internal developments. We are prepared to assist the Government of Sri Lanka in the recovery of war ravaged areas in the north and East of the country and to help alleviate the humanitarian problems of the large numbers of the local population in the IDP camps, so that they are able to live normal lives once again. We are contributing substantially to this humanitarian effort, including setting up of a field hospital at Vavaniya, supply of shelter material, despatch of de-mining teams and supply of more than 1.75 lakh family packs of food and relief supplies. Our Prime Minister has announced Rs. 500 crores assistance, and, if need be, he has also promised to increase the aid quantum.

Sir, no discussion on our neighbourhood policy would be complete without reference to our relations with Pakistan. The people of our two countries must be allowed to prosper in an

*Not recorded.

atmosphere of peace. At the same time, we cannot and will not be oblivious to the continued threat of terrorism emanating from Pakistan. Progress is not possible in our dialogue with Pakistan in an atmosphere vitiated by violence or the threat to use of violence. The Joint Statement of July 17, 2009 encapsulates this view and standpoint that any meaningful dialogue with Pakistan can only follow the concrete fulfilment of their commitment not to allow their territory to be used for terrorist activities against India.

My esteemed friend, Shri Arun Shourie, referred to Pakistan in some detail in the course of his speech. He is now advocating a policy towards Pakistan that his own Government did not follow. He accuses us of having removed the pressure on Pakistan to act against terrorism and of having lowered 'our expectations'. I simply do not see how this is so. Let me assure him that as the Prime Minister has said, he and I have left the Pakistani leadership in no doubt whatsoever that we expect action against the perpetrators of Mumbai and other terrorist attacks against India, the dismantling of the infrastructure of terrorism in Pakistan and the prevention of such future attacks. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Mr. Minister, will you say something about the Joint Statement? ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has referred to the Joint Statement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: I welcome the fact that we debate in a democratic manner our policy towards Pakistan. But to make a point or oppose the Government, let us not give more credence to what other say over what Prime Minister and our own Government have formally stated. We are not here to question each others' motives. We are united against terrorism period. But equally, we will continue the consistent policy towards Pakistan which includes dialogue in the steps we will take, provided Pakistan takes the necessary steps that have been spelt out to them in unequivocal terms by the Prime Minister in his meeting with Mr. Geelani, and subsequently, the hon. Prime Minister has made to both Houses of Parliament. Shri Biswajit Daimary and Shri S.S. Ahluwalia raised the issue of development of North East and its role in our foreign policy. North East has been an important focus area for the Ministry. Apart from the Kaladan multi-model transit transport project to connect ports in India's Eastern seaboard to the North Eastern States via Myanmar and the Tamu-Kalewa-Kalemyo (TKK) road, connecting Manipur to Myanmar. India is also taking several steps to enhance engagement of North Eastern States with Myanmar. We are opening up trade at border points with Myanmar. In our discussions with Bangladesh, we have accorded the highest priority to enhance connectivity between Bangladesh and North Eastern States. My friend, Shri Tariq Anwar mentioned our 'Look East' policy. We have taken various initiatives in the ASEAN East Asia Summit, which

includes India, New Zealand, Australia, Japan, China and South Korea. BIMSTEC, they have Bengal initiative for multi-sectoral technical and economic cooperation comprises Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Myanmar, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Thailand. The Mekong-Ganga Cooperation which should include India, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam have great potential in rejuvenating our historical and our civilisational links with our neighbours in the East. With the rapidly changing economic circumstances in the world, we see great opportunities in advancing the process of our economic integration with the ASEAN and other countries in the region. In this activity, we have been coordinating closely with our Ministry of Development of North Eastern Region. With China, India has a strategic and cooperative partnership. We have an established architecture for dialogue through which all issues of common interest and concern are discussed. Bilateral trade has grown significantly and a target of 60 billion US dollars by 2010 has been jointly set for such trade. The shared vision for the 21st century signed by Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, with his Chinese counterpart, in January, 2008 has added a regional and multi-dimensional aspect to our bilateral ties. Mr. Deputy Chairman, certainly there are outstanding issues between India and China. The special representatives are discussing the boundary question and both countries have agreed to seek a fair, reasonable and mutually acceptable settlement to this issue. The matter of course, is complex and requires time and lots of patience. Meanwhile, our endeavour is to ensure that peace and tranquillity are maintained in the border areas. An hon. Member raised the issue of constructing a dam by China...

श्री रघुनन्दन शर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश): सर, यह क्या उत्तर आ रहा है?...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: बिल्कुल नहीं।

श्री रघुनन्दन शर्मा: मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इधर-उधर की बात न करके यह बताइए कि यह कारवां लूटा क्यों?...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: ठीक है। मंत्री जी, आप बोलिए।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा): हमें नहीं पता था कि इस स्तर पर भी...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: पाणि जी, आप कृपया शांत रहिए।

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: An hon. Member raised an issue of construction of a dam by China on the Brahmaputra. We have instituted a mechanism of expert level talks and water resources between India and China to focus on issues such as, exchange of feeder control data and emergency response management in Brahmaputra and Sutlej rivers. The Gulf region is our neighbour across the Arabian Sea and has a special place in India's external relations framework. India has had close civilisational contacts, trade and exchanges with this region, spanning several centuries. The Gulf region has left an indelible imprint on our history, on our

culture and on our civilisation. India's relations with GCC countries have evolved and have been strengthened over the years. India's 'look West Policy" directed at the GCC is reflective of our desire to deepen our relations with the countries of the Gulf and we are fashioning a structure of multi faceted cooperation covering all sectors. The Gulf region is an area of special focus in our Foreign Policy. It forms part of India's strategic neighbourhood, is an important source of energy, home to over four and a half million Indians and a major trading partner. India enjoys excellent relations with these countries and bilateral engagement during this period has witnessed further growth and diversification. There has been intensification of high-level interactions in the recent past. Some hon. Members have raised the issue of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. India has a consistent and unwavering record of support for the Palestinian cause since the days of our freedom struggle. Our policy is in line with UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. The Quartet on the Middle East is the US, Russia, EU and the United Nations.

Sir, I now come to the roadmap and the Arab Peace Initiative. India supports a united, independent, viable sovereign State of Palestine with East Jerusalem as its capital, living within secure and recognised borders side-by-side at peace with Israel. We have expressed concern for the continuing expansion of Israeli settlements in occupied Palestine territories. The US $ 10 million grant made in March, 2009, as Budget support for the Palestine National Authority, is but one of many examples of India's long history of assistance for Palestine. During the visit of the President of the Palestinian National Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, to India, in October, 2008, the foundation-stone of the Palestine Embassy in New Delhi was laid which is now near completion. The Embassy building is a gift of the Government and the people of India to Palestine. We also assist Palestine in developing its human resource through ITEC programme.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: सर, आप एक बहुत सीनियर लीडर हैं...(व्यवधान)...

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY; THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF EARTH SCIENCES; THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE; THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS; AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI PRITHVIRAJ CHAVAN): Sir, why is he disturbing all the time?*...(Interruptions)...* This is not fair *...(Interruptions)...* Why is he disturbing when the Minister is giving reply?

श्री उपसभापति: पाणि जी, आप बैठिए, यह बहुत गलत है।...**(व्यवधान)**... I think, you are not bringing credit to this House. The debate is on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. The discussion is on the entire Ministry. You can expect answer only what you want. The Minister is covering the Ministry, not a particular subject in which you are interested.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Several hon. Members have raised the issue of relations with the USA*...(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a House of Elders. We have to be different.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: I would like to underline here that our relations with the USA are not at the cost of our relations with any other country. India-US relations have been transformed in recent years and the bilateral engagement extends across a wide spectrum which include, science and technology, energy, counter terrorism, Defence, security, trade and commerce, education, space among other issues. A major development was the signing of the India-US Civil Nuclear Agreement in October, 2008. This landmark Agreement has been followed by similar agreements with other countries for civil nuclear co-operation. A clearly defined architecture for dialogue was announced during the recent visit of US Secretary of State to India this month. The firm foundation provided by this robust bilateral engagement has enabled the India-US strategic partnership to strengthen itself in areas of global engagement. The two countries interact closely on global issues of common concern, such as energy security, disarmament and non-proliferation, international peace and security, multilateral trade organisations and the G-20 process.

Sir, some hon. Members have asked about the end-use monitoring arrangements that we have agreed with the USA. Sir, all Governments have arrangement to ensure that Defence-related weapons and equipments that are transferred do not fall into the wrong hands and are only for legitimate use. We too do so for our exports of such materials. Successive Governments of India have entered into these arrangements with supplier-States, including the United States for several years. With the US, which has its own legal requirements, we have entered into *ad hoc* arrangements for individual supplies in the past. What we have now done is to agree on the end-use monitoring arrangements that would henceforth be referred to in letters of acceptance of Indian procurement of US defence technology and equipment. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Do you have such agreements with France and Russia also?

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Well, I will come back to you on that. ...*(Interruptions)*... These provide for joint consultations and modalities, and, in no way,...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: सर, स्टेटमेंट ले कर दीजिए। ..(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: मिस्टर पाणि, इतना बोलने के बाद भी you are defying the Chair. Please maintain some decorum. आप हर बात में इंटरप्ट मत करिए। It will neither bring credit to you nor to the House. Let me be very frank.

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: These provide for joint consultations and modalities and, in no way, compromise our sovereignty, our limit, our sovereign choice of whether, where and what weapons we, choose to buy, from other countries, for our own national defence. The arrangements that we have agreed, are fully in consonance with our sovereignty and dignity. In the last two decades, we have expanded the scope and depth of economic and strategic interaction with different countries, groups and regions, including, China, Russia, United States, Japan, European Union, South-East Asia, Central Asia, IBSA, BRIC, the G-5 and the G-8. This

enhanced interaction with the global community reflects India's growing stature on the international States. Against the background of the global financial and economic crisis, India's participation in global grouping, like the G-20, the G-8, the G-5 Outreach Group and the BRIC has been highly valued. At the recent G-8 and the G-5 Outreach Meeting in L'Aquila, our assessment and views were heard with attention and were deeply appreciated. Our view, as articulated by our Prime Minister, was on the strength of domestic stimulus packages which aim to make the poor and the youth bankable; that the old pattern of economic growth, driven by consumption in the USA, is no longer sustainable; and, that the first and overriding priority of Developing Countries, like, India, is economic and social development and poverty eradication. Another example of our increased global engagement is India's membership of the BRIC countries — Brazil, Russia, India and China. The first stand-alone formal summit meeting of the four BRIC countries was held in June, 2009 at Yekaterinburg in Russia. The main issues for discussion amongst the leaders were the implications of the current global, financial and economic crisis and the potential for cooperation among the four BRIC countries. These processes also give us greater opportunities to shape the new global balance of power. The ongoing economic crisis has highlighted the need for redistributing power within international financial institutions, like, the World Bank, the IMF. Such redistribution needs to be extended to political organs of global governance, such as, the UN Security Council.

Some hon. Members expressed appreciation of India's active participation in the IBSA grouping, that is, the grouping of India, Brazil and South Africa and the BRIC. India has been alive to the changing global realities of today, and has been quite quick to grasp their import. Our recent experience with groupings, such as these, has been that the emerging economies have considerable potential for not only developing synergies between themselves, but also for making an impact on the shaping the outcomes of the international debate on critical issues of concern to all of us. This has implications for the future shape of the world order, which is already in a flux for variety of reasons. With such an active diplomatic interaction, we feel quite confident that India and other countries will be able to protect our interest in the World Trade Organization negotiations, about which some apprehensions were expressed.

With regard to the specific issue of a reported ban on transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technology, the recent G-8 statement at the L'Aquila Summit, which is a political statement, and not a legally binding document, refers to discussions at the NSG, which are ongoing. No decision has been taken by the NSG. The Government has been in regular touch with the NSG, Troika, past, current and future chairman and with the key NSG countries. As a part of this dialogue, there was an India-NSG-Troika meeting on 11th May, 2009. During this meeting, the NSG delegation was made aware of our position and of our concerns. The NSG delegation said that they would convey these to the group. It is India's expectation that our international partners in the civil-nuclear cooperation will implement the bilateral agreements that we have entered into.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, India continues to strengthen its partnership with other Developing Countries in Africa, Latin America, Central Asia and the South-East Asia. India's long-standing historical relationship with Africa acquired further substance and even deeper relevance with a first-ever India-Africa Forum Summit, held at New Delhi in April, 2008. At the Summit, India renewed its deep commitment to contribute and work with our African partners for the development of Africa. India also is making efforts to cultivate stronger bonds with the countries of the Latin America and the Caribbean region, and to explore the enormous opportunities that exist for trade and economic interaction with the region. Under the ITEC and the SCAAP programmes, India has been assisting the countries in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Eurasia. In the field of capacity building and around 5000 professionals from 158 Developing Countries have attended various training and educational courses in India in areas of interest and advantage to them.

Hon. Members have expressed concern about the attack on Indian students in Australia. The issue has been taken up at the highest levels of the Australian Government. The Government of Australia has conveyed to us their firm commitment to ensuring the safety and security of Indian students in Australia. Some specific steps have been taken by the Australian Government, including, launch of a police operation, specifically to investigate the incidents of attacks on students; provision of twenty-four hour hotline, both in Hindi and English, by a Community Reference Group to provide support, information and advice to Indian students, who are victims of crime; and, setting up of police community reference group to improve communication between the police and the student community. More importantly, the Australian Government have also stated that they are considering the possibility of amending the existing law to enlarge the definition of 'offence' to include race, religion, ethnicity and nationality-related violence against people or individuals. The proposed amendment would strengthen the police response to the attacks against Indian students.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, performing Haj is one of the holiest and the most cherished dreams of our Muslim brothers and sisters. For my Ministry and, indeed the Government of India, facilitating the Haj Pilgrimage year after year is among the most elaborate year-long exercise and an important task undertaken by us both, in India and abroad. We have been striving to bring about improvements in Haj Pilgrimage management to make it more comfortable and affordable. An hon. Member, Shri Shreegopal Vyas, referred to the size of the Haj Goodwill Delegation. The Haj Goodwill Delegation comprises of eminent personalities sent to assess the Haj arrangements. It is not possible to lay down strict criteria for selecting leading eminent community members. Some leading members of the delegation also attend the dinner traditionally hosted by The Majesty, the King of Saudi Arabia. As regard the family members of the delegation members, the Government of India does not make any arrangement nor does it pay for their travel or stay. As regards rationalising the size of the Goodwill Delegation, the matter is under consideration. An hon. Member, Shri Malihabadi raised the issue of waiver of

service tax being levied on private operators arranging Haj visits. Since the services are rendered abroad, we too have received representation from the private operators and the matter will be referred to the Ministry of Finance for their consideration. As regards setting up of a Haj Corporation, wide-ranging reforms in the area of Haj management are also being examined. My Ministry has launched the Passport Seva Project in August 2007, which when completed will substantially improve the level of services and the quality of services offered to citizens for passport-related matters. This is one of the largest e-Governance initiatives that the Government of India has undertaken. The project envisages creation of 77 Passport Seva Kendras across the country, the creation of Call Centres opening 24 x 7 in 17 languages and a centralised nation-wide computerised system for issuance of passports. The launch of pilot site is expected in October 2009 at Bangalore covering the whole of Karnataka and Chandigarh, covering parts of States of Punjab and Haryana and the Union Territory of Chandigarh. The project is scheduled to be rolled out throughout the country in three waves, and expected to be completed by June 2010. Some Members, particularly, Shri Arun Shourie, Shri N.K. Singh and Shri Naresh Gujral raised administrative issues related to my Ministry. I fully endorse the very valid points made by the hon. Members on the continuing need for the Ministry of External Affairs to respond with the spirit of creativity and innovation to the requirements and challenges imposed by a rapidly changing world situation. We remain ever sensitive to the need for constantly reviewing enhancing the human resource strength of the Ministry, providing the requisite Budgetary enhancement and giving importance to the initial training and mid-career training of our diplomats and officials. Mid career training has now been made mandatory for an officer to be promoted to Joint Secretary and Additional Secretary levels. We have undertaken a major overhaul of our promotion policies. We are also augmenting our manpower through selective and need-based induction of specialist officers from other Ministries and Departments into the Ministry of External Affairs. Approval of the Union Cabinet has also been secured for a forward-looking expansion of the Officer cadre of the Ministry. The needs of our commercial diplomacy and the projection of India's soft power and civilizational values are receiving particular attention in this scenario.

The need for constantly infusing the working of foreign policy with new ideas and concepts is also fully recognized. The Indian Council for World Affairs is a research institution that works closely with the Ministry in this regard by providing an effective forum for exchange of ideas and identifying areas for further study and research that involve discussion and debate with scholars outside the Government.

Our Missions abroad also interact on a systematic basis with foreign universities and India Study Programme so that India's viewpoint is effectively articulated in order to bridge information and awareness gaps.

I welcome the constructive suggestions that we have heard from several Members. Shri Arun Shourie said that we should quadruple the size of our Foreign Service and our Foreign Aid Budget. Shri N.K. Singh spoke of doubling the IFS. The Cabinet decided last year on a Five Year Programme to double the size of our diplomatic cadre. We will certainly also look at boosting the financial resources available to our diplomacy as the tasks and demands on us grow.

Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad noted the need for training in neighbouring-country languages. The Ministry is training more IFS officers in neighbouring-country languages. Our officers possess considerable language skills that are put to constant use in the conduct of our diplomacy.

Sardar Tarlochan Singh raised the Sikh Turban issue in France. The Government of India have made a number of derrasches at the highest levels to the French Government conveying the sensitivity of the issue and the need to find a satisfactory solution. Prime Minister, when he was in France, raised this issue in his recent meeting with President Sarkozy of France. The French President assured the Prime Minister that nobody in France will be prevented from wearing the turban. As regards restrictions on the use of turbans by the Sikh community, in State-funded schools as well as while getting photographed for official French documents, an *Aide Memoir* suggesting possible solution has been handed over.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) in the Chair]

Shreegopal Vyas had raised the matter of the Savarkar Memorial in Marseilles. The matter is being pursued by our Embassy in France and with the offices of the Mayor of Marseilles on a regular basis. It has been conveyed by the concerned French officials that they need to examine some previous records to ascertain the current status of the matter. However, there has been a delay in this due to the displacement of the Office of the Mayor of Marseilles from its original location due to damage caused by catastrophic storms in 1998. We are continuing to pursue the issue with the local authorities in Marseilles. Some hon. Members raised the issue of public and cultural diplomacy. The Indian Council for Cultural Relations already has 21 cultural centres abroad, 15 more new cultural centres are on the anvil with one in Tokyo to be inaugurated shortly this year. The process of identification of land for a centre in Washington is underway.

Hon. Chairperson, I have tried to present a picture of some of the more significant achievements and activities of the Ministry of External Affairs in the last one year. The list has been necessarily selective and has not covered many other areas of India's foreign relations. At the same time, the achievements mentioned will, I trust, convey a clear picture of the positive trends of India's interaction with the world's major powers and our development cooperation with other developing countries. As already stated, there are also several challenges being faced by Indian — foreign policy including the destabilising effects of cross-border terrorism and the world financial crisis which has inevitably affected the domestic economy even though the

negative effects on our economy have been relatively less than in some other countries. It has always been the Ministry of External Affairs' endeavour to follow a dynamic foreign policy that responds effectively to changes in the international environment. It is also sensitive to India's developmental needs.

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I wish to seek certain clarifications. *(Interruptions)* Sir, can I seek certain clarifications? ***...(Interruptions)...***

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. No clarifications. ***...(Interruptions)...***

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, please allow us to seek some clarifications. ***...(Interruptions)...***

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, one clarification, please. ***...(Interruptions)...***

SHRI PENUMALLI MADHU (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, why are we not being allowed to seek clarifications? ***...(Interruptions)...***

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): The House stands adjourned to meet at 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-two minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) in the Chair.]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

The Incest Offences Bill, 2009

SHRIMATI SHOBHANA BHARTIA (Nominated): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for punishment for the offences relating to incest and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRIMATI SHOBHANA BHARTIA: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

———————

The White Asbestos (Ban on Use and Import) Bill, 2009

SHRI VIJAY JAWAHARLAL DARDA (Maharashtra): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for a total ban on use and import of white asbestos in the country and to promote the use of safer and cheaper alternative to white asbestos and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto. ***...(Interruptions)...***

DR. T. SUBBARAMI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I would like to raise my objection and inform the House. ***...(Interruptions)...*** Sir, I object here because for the last forty years white